



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/832,825  | 04/12/2001  | Kazunori Kaneda      | Q64042              | 1925             |
| 7590  | 12/30/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,<br>MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC<br>2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.<br>Washington, DC 20037-3202 |             |                      | FISCHER, JUSTIN R   |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 1733                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JK

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

|                        |                   |                     |                  |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Application No.</b> | 09/832,825        | <b>Applicant(s)</b> | KANEDA, KAZUNORI |
| <b>Examiner</b>        | Justin R. Fischer | <b>Art Unit</b>     | 1733             |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2 and 16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11: Mori substantially discloses the tire construction of the claimed invention, including a squeegee rubber layer or innerliner layer having hydrotalcite in an amount between 0.1 and 30 phr. In this instance, the innerliner layer is directly adjacent the carcass layer. As correctly set forth by applicant, Mori suggests that the hydrotalcite compound provides improved scorch resistance- such a disclosure, however, does not restrict the inclusion of additional, well-known additives in order to obtain additional benefits which are recognized as being desirable in all tire constructions. Fukumoto specifically teaches that a salt of an organic acid is included in an innerliner layer directly adjacent a carcass layer to provide improved adhesion with the reinforcing elements of the carcass. Herbelleauu was additionally cited in the previous office action to further recognize the well-known use of such salts in rubber layers to provide improved adhesion with carcass reinforcing elements. Thus, the evidence of record clearly indicates that such salts are well known additives that provide improved adhesion, wherein such a benefit would have been desirable in all tire constructions. This benefit would have provided ample motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mori, there being a reasonable expectation of success in forming the innerliner of Mori with a salt of an organic acid. It is emphasized that the fact that Mori fails to expressly identify "improved adhesion" as being desirable does not make it unobviousness to include said salt in the tire of Mori. It is further noted that the combination of references recognize that said salts represent well known additives and their use in tire rubber compositions is independent of the base rubber composition- there is nothing in either one of Fukumoto or Herbelleauu that suggests

Art Unit: 1733

that said salts would be uncombinable with the base rubber composition of Mori. In fact, Herbelleau generally teaches that such an additive is included a bead rubber layer without limiting the base rubber composition.



Justin Fischer

December 27, 2005